

REMARKS

These remarks respond to the Office Action mailed July 14, 2005. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 16-19 have been withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. Claims 1 and 5 are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,502 to Dishongh et al. Dishongh is directed to a circuit that senses changes in electrical characteristics of solder joints and generates signals based on the sensed characteristics.

Dishongh fails to anticipate claim 1. Claim 1 is directed to a semiconductor chip having contacts on a front surface and pads on a rear surface. The Examiner points to Fig. 1 of Dishongh, which shows an assembly 100 made up of an integrated circuit package 102 and a printed circuit board 104 connected by solder balls 106. Dishongh discloses two separate chips with connections on only one side of each chip. Neither the integrated circuit package 102 nor the printed circuit board 104 have contacts on a front surface and pads on a rear surface as specifically recited in claim 1. Thus, Dishongh does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 depend on claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 5-15 were rejected as obvious over Dishongh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,150,724 to Wenzel et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,313,522 to Akram et al.

Claim 5 was rejected as obvious over Wenzel in view of Donough. But the combination of Wenzel and Donough fails to render claim 5 obvious. Neither Dishongh nor Wenzel discloses a semiconductor chip having internal components, contacts on the

front surface, and pads on the rear surface. The Examiner points to Fig. 14 of Wenzel which shows two chips, each with bumps on one surface of the chip. Neither of the chips has contacts on a front surface and pads on a rear surface. The Examiner claims that Wenzel may be combined with Dishongh to form the assembly recited in claim 5. Dishongh, however, also fails to disclose any one chip with contacts on the front surface and pads on a rear surface as recited in claim 5. Thus, the combination of Wenzel and Dishongh fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 5.

Applicant designates the dependent claims as being allowable by virtue of their ultimate dependency upon allowable independent claims. Although Applicant has not separately argued the patentability of each of the dependent claims, Applicant's failure to do so is not to be taken as an admission that the features of the dependent claims are not themselves patentable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

Conclusion

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which she may have.

Application No.: 10/600,186

Docket No.: TESSERA 3.0-297

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Matthew E. Hanley

Registration No.: 51,773

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

600984_1.DOC